arXiv:1409.8196v5 [cs.SI] 30 Sep 2015

Hyperbolicity, degeneracy, and expansion of random intersection graphs

Matthew Farrell[1], Timothy D. Goodrich[2], Nathan Lemons[3], Felix Reidl[4], Fernando Sánchez Villaamil[4] and Blair D. Sullivan[2]

[1] Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Washington
Seattle, WA, U.S.A.
msf9@uw.edu
[2] Department of Computer Science, North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC, U.S.A.
{tdgoodri,blair_sullivan}@ncsu.edu
[3] Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, NM, U.S.A.
nlemons@gmail.com
[4] Theoretical Computer Science, RWTH Aachen
Aachen, Germany
{reidl,fernando.sanchez}@cs.rwth-aachen.de

Abstract. We establish the conditions under which several algorithmically exploitable structural features hold for random intersection graphs, a natural model for many real-world networks where edges correspond to shared attributes. Specifically, we fully characterize the degeneracy of random intersection graphs, and prove that the model asymptotically almost surely produces graphs with hyperbolicity at least $\log n$. Further, we prove that when degenerate, the graphs generated by this model belong to a bounded-expansion graph class with high probability, a property particularly suitable for the design of linear time algorithms.

1 Introduction

There has been a recent surge of interest in analyzing large graphs, stemming from the rise in popularity (and scale) of social networks and significant growth of relational data in science and engineering fields (e.g. gene expressions, cybersecurity logs, and neural connectomes). One significant challenge in the field is the lack of deep understanding of the underlying structure of various classes of real-world networks. Here, we focus on two structural characteristics that can be exploited algorithmically: *bounded expansion* and *hyperbolicity*.

A graph class has *bounded expansion*[1] if for every member G, one cannot form arbitrarily dense graphs by contracting subgraphs of small radius. Intuitively, this naturally corresponds to sparse interactions between locally dense clusters or communities. Formally, the density of every minor of G is bounded by a

[1] Not related to the notion of expander graphs.

function of the *depth* of that minor (the maximum radius of its branch sets). Bounded expansion offers a structural generalization of both bounded-degree and graphs excluding a (topological) minor. Algorithmically, this property is extremely useful: every first-order-definable problem is decidable in linear fpt-time in these classes [13]. For example, counting the number of appearances of a fixed pattern graph as a subgraph can be computed in linear time [12,25]. We also consider δ-*hyperbolicity*, which restricts the structure of shortest-path distances in the graph to be tree-like. Hyperbolicity is closely tied to treelength [9], but unrelated to measures of structural density such as bounded expansion. Algorithms for graph classes of bounded hyperbolicity often exploit computable approximate distance trees [9] or greedy routing [19]. Both of these properties present challenges for empirical evaluation—bounded expansion is only defined with respect to graph classes (not for single instances), and hyperbolicity is an extremal statistic whose $O(n^4)$ computation is infeasible for many of today's large data sets. As is typical in the study of network structure, we instead ask how the properties behave with respect to randomized models which are designed to mimic aspects of network formation and structure.

In this paper, we consider the *random intersection graph model* introduced by Karoński, Scheinerman, and Singer-Cohen [30,18] which has recently attracted significant attention in the literature [5,11,16,14,29]. *Random intersection graphs* are based on the premise that network edges often represent underlying shared interests or attributes. The model first creates a bipartite object-attribute graph $B = (V, A, E)$ by adding edges uniformly at random with a fixed per-edge probability $p(\alpha)$, then considers the *intersection graph*: $G := (V, E')$ where $xy \in E'$ iff the neighborhoods of the vertices x, y in B have a non-empty intersection. The parameter α controls both the ratio of attributes to objects and the probability p: for n objects the number of attributes m is proportional to n^α and the probability p to $n^{-(1+\alpha)/2}$.

Recently, random intersection graphs have gained popularity in modeling real-world data. For example, Zhao et al. use random intersection graphs to model the Eschenauer-Gligor (EG) key predistribution scheme for secure connections in wireless networking [35,34,32]. Given sensor nodes and limitations on their communication ranges (visibility), the problem is to design a topology for optimal communication. By modeling sensor link unreliability and transmission constraints with Erdős-Rényi and random geometric graphs, respectively, the topology of the final EG scheme can be computed with a random intersection graph on the sensors. Random intersection graphs have also been used in modeling cybersecurity [3], the spread of epidemics [1], social networks [31,27], and clustering [33].

Beyond inherently modeling native structure in many real-world applications, random intersection graphs also have (1) relative mathematical tractability yielded by the independence of events in the underlying edge creation process, and (2) the ability to generate graphs with key structural properties matching real data—namely sparsity, (tunable) clustering and assortativity [11,4,5]. Together, these features allow the design of random graph generators that produce graphs with specific and well-understood properties such as connectivity and degree

distribution. Extending this mathematical understanding, we examine more complex structural properties such as expansion and hyperbolicity. Specifically, in this paper we present the following results on the structure of random intersection graphs:

(i) For $\alpha \leq 1$, with high probability (w.h.p.), random intersection graphs are somewhere dense (and thus do not have bounded expansion) and have unbounded degeneracy.
(ii) For $\alpha > 1$, w.h.p. random intersection graphs have bounded expansion (and thus constant degeneracy).
(iii) Under reasonable restrictions on the constants in the model, random intersection graphs have hyperbolicity $\Omega(\log n)$ asymptotically almost surely.

In particular, the second result strengthens the original claim that the model generates sparse graphs for $\alpha > 1$, by establishing they are in fact *structurally* sparse in a robust sense. We note that random intersection graphs only exhibit tunable clustering when $\alpha = 1$ [10], so our results strongly support the following: Homogeneous random intersection graphs fail at being sparse and having tunable clustering simultaneously[2]. Finally, we note that the third result is negative—our bound implies a $\log n$ lower bound on the treelength [9].

2 Preliminaries

We use standard notation: $G = (V, E)$ denotes a finite, simple graph on the vertices V with edge set E. For a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a vertex $x \in V$, $N_G(x)$ denotes the set of neighbors of x in G. We often write $|G|$ to denote the number of vertices in G, a slight abuse of notation. A subgraph $H = (W, F)$ of G is *induced* if for every pair of vertices $u, v \in W$, the edge $(u, v) \in F$ if and only if $(u, v) \in E$. Paths and cycles consisting of k edges are said to have *length* k and are denoted P_k and C_k respectively. For vertices x and y in a graph let $P[x, y]$ denote a shortest path from x to y.

Since this paper is concerned with asymptotic results, we use standard asymptotic terminology: for each integer n, let $\mathcal{G}_n$ define a distribution on graphs with n vertices (for example, coming from a random graph model). We say the events E_n defined on $\mathcal{G}_n$ hold *asymptotically almost surely* (a.a.s.) if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}[E_n] = 1$. Furthermore, we say an event occurs *with high probability* (w.h.p.) if for any $c \geq 1$ the event occurs with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-c})$. As a shorthand, we will simply say that $\mathcal{G}_n$ *has some property* a.a.s. (or w.h.p.).

2.1 Random Intersection Graphs

A wide variety of random intersection graph models have been defined in the literature; in this paper, we restrict our attention to the most well-studied of these, $G(n, m, p)$, which is defined as follows:

[2] It should be noted that constant clustering and bounded expansion are not orthogonal [12].

Definition 1 (Random Intersection Graph Model). *Fix positive constants α, β and γ. Let B be a random bipartite graph on parts of size n and $m = \beta n^{\alpha}$ with each edge present independently with probability $p = \gamma n^{-(1+\alpha)/2}$. Let V (the nodes) denote the part of size n and A (the attributes) the part of size m. The associated* random intersection graph *$G = G(n, m, p)$ is defined on the nodes V: two nodes are connected in G if they share (are both adjacent to in B) at least one attribute in A.*

We note that $G(n, m, p)$ defines a distribution $\mathcal{G}_n$ on graphs with n vertices. The notation $G = G(n, m, p)$ denotes a graph G that is randomly sampled from the distribution $\mathcal{G}_n$. Throughout the manuscript, given a random intersection graph $G(n, m, p)$ we will refer to B, the associated bipartite graph on n nodes and m attributes from which G is formed.

In order to work with graph classes formed by the random intersection graph model, we will need a technical result that bounds the number of attributes in the neighborhood of a subset of nodes around its expected value. These results can be found in Section 2.4.

2.2 Degeneracy & Expansion

Although it is widely accepted that complex networks tend to be sparse (in terms of edge density), this property does not suffice for reducing the algorithmic complexity of NP-hard analysis tasks. In order to take advantage of parameterized algorithms, we focus on *structural* sparseness. For instance, it is not enough for a graph to be sparse on average, we would also like it to have sparse subgraphs. This motivates a very general class of structurally sparse graphs—those of bounded *degeneracy*: A graph is d-degenerate if every subgraph has a vertex of degree at most d. It is easy to see that the degeneracy is lower-bounded by the size of the largest clique. Thus, the degeneracy of intersection graphs is bounded below by the maximum attribute degree in the associated bipartite graph (since each attribute contributes a complete subgraph of size equal to its degree to the intersection graph). For certain parameter values, this lower bound will, w.h.p., give the correct order of magnitude of the degeneracy of the graph.

Bounded degeneracy however is often too weak a structural guarantee for the design fast algorithms. Here we focus on the stronger structural property of *bounded expansion* which provides a rich framework of algorithmic tools [22]. In the context of networks, bounded expansion captures the idea that networks decompose into small dense structures (e.g. communities) connected by a sparse global structure. More formally, we characterize bounded-expansion classes using special graph minors and an associated density measure (the grad).

Definition 2 (Shallow topological minor, nails, subdivision vertices). *A graph M is an r-*shallow topological minor of *G if a $(\leq 2r)$-subdivision of M is isomorphic to a subgraph H' of G. We call H' a* model of *M* in *G. For simplicity, we assume by default that $V(M) \subseteq V(H')$ such that the isomorphism between M and H' is the identity when restricted to $V(M)$. The vertices $V(M)$*

are called nails *and the vertices* $V(H') \setminus V(M)$ subdivision vertices. *The set of all* r*-shallow topological minors of a graph* G *is denoted by* $G \mathbin{\widetilde{\nabla}} r$.

Definition 3 (Topological grad). *For a graph* G *and integer* $r \geq 0$*, the* topological greatest reduced average density (grad) at depth r *is defined as*

$$\widetilde{\nabla}_r(G) = \max_{H \in G \mathbin{\widetilde{\nabla}} r} |E(H)|/|V(H)|.$$

For a graph class $\mathcal{G}$*, define* $\widetilde{\nabla}_r(\mathcal{G}) = \sup_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \widetilde{\nabla}_r(G)$.

Definition 4 (Bounded expansion). *A graph class* $\mathcal{G}$ *has* bounded expansion *if there exists a function* f *such that for all* r*, we have* $\widetilde{\nabla}_r(\mathcal{G}) < f(r)$.

When introduced, bounded expansion was originally defined using an equivalent characterization based on the notion of *shallow minors* (cf. [22]): H is a r-shallow minor of G if H can be obtained from G by contracting disjoint subgraphs of radius at most r. In the context of our paper, however, the topological shallow minor variant proves more useful, and we restrict our attention to this setting. Let us point out that bounded expansion implies bounded degeneracy, with $2f(0)$ being an upper bound on the degeneracy of the graphs. In particular, $G \mathbin{\widetilde{\nabla}} 0$ is the set of all subgraphs of G.

The following alternative characterization of bounded expansion is often helpful in establishing the property for classes formed by random graph models, since it allows us to restrict ourselves to shallow minors whose model uses at most a fraction of all vertices.

Proposition 1 ([26,25]). *A class* $\mathcal{C}$ *of graphs has bounded expansion if and only if there exists real-valued functions* $f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4 \colon \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}^+$ *such that the following two conditions hold:*

(i) For all positive ϵ *and for all graphs* $G \in \mathcal{C}$ *with* $|V(G)| > f_1(\epsilon)$*, it holds that* $\frac{1}{|V(G)|} \cdot |\{v \in V(G) \colon \deg(v) \geq f_2(\epsilon)\}| \leq \epsilon$.

(ii) For all $r \in \mathbf{N}$ *and for all* $H \subseteq G \in \mathcal{C}$ *with* $\widetilde{\nabla}_r(H) > f_3(r)$*, it follows that* $|V(H)| \geq f_4(r) \cdot |V(G)|$.

Intuitively, this states that any class of graphs with bounded expansion is characterized by two properties:

(i) all sufficiently large members of the class have a small fraction of vertices of large degree;
(ii) all subgraphs of $G \in \mathcal{C}$ whose shallow topological minors are sufficiently dense must necessarily span a large fraction of the vertices of G.

Finally, in order to characterize when the model is not structually sparse, we define another class in the hierarchy—*nowhere dense* is a generalization of bounded expansion in which we measure the *clique number* instead of the edge density of shallow minors. Let $\omega(G)$ denote the size of the largest complete subgraph of a graph G and let $\omega(\mathcal{G}) = \sup_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \omega(G)$ be the natural extension to graph classes $\mathcal{G}$.

Definition 5 (Nowhere dense [23,24]). *A graph class $\mathcal{G}$ is* nowhere dense *if there exists a function f such that for all $r \in \mathbf{N}$ it holds that $\omega(\mathcal{G} \widetilde{\nabla} r) < f(r)$.*

In particular, all bounded expansion classes are nowhere dense, while the converse is not true. A graph class is *somewhere dense* precisely when it is not nowhere dense. While in general a graph class with unbounded degeneracy is not necessarily somewhere dense, the negative proofs presented here show that members of the graph class contain large cliques w.h.p.. This simultaneously implies unbounded degeneracy and that the class is somewhere dense (as a clique is a 0-subdivision of itself). Consequently, we prove a clear dichotomy: random intersection graphs are either have bounded expansion or they are somewhere dense.

2.3 Gromov's Hyperbolicity

The concept of δ-hyperbolicity was introduced by Gromov in the context of geometric group theory [15]. It captures how "tree-like" a graph is in terms of its metric structure, and has received attention in the analysis of networks and informatics graphs. We refer the reader to [19,21,8,17], and references therein, for details on the motivating network applications;

There are several ways of characterizing δ-hyperbolic metric spaces, all of which are equivalent up to constant factors [7,9,15]. Since graphs are naturally geodesic metric spaces when distance is defined using shortest paths, we will use the definition based on δ-slim triangles (originally attributed to Rips [15,7]).

Definition 6. *A graph $G = (V, E)$ is* δ-hyperbolic *if for all $x, y, z \in V$, for every choice of geodesic (shortest) paths between them —denoted $P[x, y], P[x, z], P[y, z]$— we have $\forall v \in P[x, y],\ \exists w \in P[x, z] \cup P[z, y] :\ d_G(v, w) \leq \delta$, where $d_G(u, v)$ is shortest-path distance in G.*

That is, if G is δ-hyperbolic, then for each triple of vertices x, y, z, and every choice of three shortest paths connecting them pairwise, each point on the shortest path from x to y must be within distance δ of a point on one of the other paths. The *hyperbolicity* of a graph G is the minimum $\delta \geq 0$ so that G is δ-hyperbolic. Note that a trivial upper bound on the hyperbolicity is half the diameter (this is true for any graph).

In this paper we give lower bounds for the hyperbolicity of the graphs in $G(n, m, p)$. We believe (but do not prove) these bounds are asymptotically the correct order of magnitude (e.g. also upper bounds). This would require that the diameter of connected components is also logarithmic in n, which has been shown for a similar model [28].

2.4 Concentration Results for Neighborhood Unions

This section states and proves that the number of attributes in the combined neighborhood of a subset of nodes is tightly concentrated around its expected value when $\alpha > 1$ and has a tight lower bound when $\alpha = 1$ and the subset under consideration is large enough.

Lemma 1. *Let $\alpha > 1$ and fix $\epsilon > 0$. Then if $G(n, m, p)$ is a random intersection graph on vertex set V and $S \subset V$, w.h.p. $(1-\epsilon)|S|mp \leq |N_B(S)| \leq (1+\epsilon)|S|mp$.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Let v be a vertex in G and let $A(v)$ denote the number of attributes adjacent to v in the associated bipartite graph B. As each attribute is adjacent to v independently with probability p, $A(v)$ has a binomial distribution and by Bernstein's inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}[A(v) > (1+\epsilon)mp] \leq \exp\Big(-\frac{\epsilon^2 mp}{2(1+\epsilon/3)}\Big) = o\Big(\frac{1}{n^c}\Big)$$

for any fixed c. By the union bound, it follows that w.h.p. $|N_B(S)| \leq (1+\epsilon)|S|mp$.

For each attribute a in B, let $\mathcal{I}_a$ be the indicator random variable equal to 1 when a has at least one neighbor in S. Since these random variables are independently and identically distributed, we again use Bernstein's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big[\sum_a \mathcal{I}_a < (1-\epsilon)m \cdot \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{I}_a = 1]\Big] &\leq \exp\Big(-\frac{\epsilon^2 m\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{I}_a]}{2}\Big)\\ &\leq \exp\Big(-\frac{\epsilon^2 m(1-\epsilon)|S|p}{2}\Big)\\ &= o\Big(\frac{1}{n^c}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

for any fixed c. The penultimate inequality follows from

$$\mathbb{P}[\,\mathcal{I}_a = 1\,] = 1 - (1-p)^{|S|} \geq |S| \cdot p(1 - o(1)).$$

□

Lemma 2. *Let $\alpha = 1$ and fix $\eta, \epsilon > 0$. If $G(n, m, p)$ is a random intersection graph on vertex set V and $S \subset V$ of size at least ηn, w.h.p. $|N_B(S)| \geq (1-\epsilon)|S|mp$.*

Proof. Again, for each attribute a in B, let $\mathcal{I}_a$ be the indicator random variable equal to 1 when a has at least one neighbor in S.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big[\sum_a \mathcal{I}_a < (1-\epsilon)m \cdot \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{I}_a = 1]\Big] &\leq \exp\Big(-\frac{\epsilon^2 m\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{I}_a]}{2}\Big)\\ &\leq \exp\Big(-\frac{\epsilon^2 m\left(1-e^{p|S|}\right)}{2}\Big)\\ &= o\Big(\frac{1}{n^c}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

for any fixed c. Again we use the fact that $\mathbb{P}[\,\mathcal{I}_a = 1\,] = 1 - (1-p)^{|S|} \geq 1 - e^{p|S|}$.

□

3 Structural sparsity of random intersection graphs

In this section we will characterize a clear break in the sparsity of graphs generated by $G(n, m, p)$, depending on the relative grown rates of the nodes and attributes in B). In each case, we analyze (probabilistically) the degeneracy and expansion of the generated class.

Theorem 1. *Fix constants α, β and γ. Let $m = \beta n^{\alpha}$ and $p = \gamma n^{-(1+\alpha)/2}$. Let $G = G(n, m, p)$. Then the following hold w.h.p.*

(i) If $\alpha < 1$, $G(n, m, p)$ is somewhere dense and G has degeneracy $\Omega(\gamma n^{(1-\alpha)/2})$.
(ii) If $\alpha = 1$, $G(n, m, p)$ is somewhere dense and G has degeneracy $\Omega(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n})$.
(iii) If $\alpha > 1$, $G(n, m, p)$ has bounded expansion and thus G has degeneracy $O(1)$.

We prove Theorem 1 separately for each of the three ranges of α. When $\alpha \leq 1$, we prove that w.h.p. the random intersection graph model generates graph classes with unbounded degeneracy by establishing the existence of a high-degree attribute in the associated bipartite graph (thus lower-bounding the clique number).

Before beginning, we note that if $G(n, m, p)$ has bounded expansion w.h.p., then for any $p' \leq p$ and $m' \leq m$ it follows that w.h.p. $G(n, m', p')$ also has bounded expansion by a simple coupling argument. Thus we can assume without loss of generality that both γ and β are greater than one.

3.1 The regime $\alpha \leq 1$

When $\alpha \leq 1$, we prove that w.h.p. the random intersection graph model generates graph classes with unbounded degeneracy by establishing the existence of a high-degree attribute in the associated bipartite graph (thus lower-bounding the clique number). The proof is divided into two lemmas, one for $\alpha < 1$ and one for $\alpha = 1$, for which we prove different lower bounds.

Lemma 3. *Fix constants $\alpha < 1, \beta$ and γ. If $m = \beta n^{\alpha}$ and $p = \gamma n^{-(1+\alpha)/2}$, then w.h.p. $G = G(n, m, p)$ has degeneracy $\Omega(\gamma n^{(1-\alpha)/2})$.*

Proof. Let $G = G(n, m, p)$ and $B = (V, A, E)$ be the bipartite graph associated with G. Define the random variable X_i to be the number of nodes in V connected to a particular attribute a_i. Then $X_i \sim Binom(n, p)$ and $\mathbb{P}[X_i < np - 1] \leq 1/2$, since the median of X_i lies between $\lfloor np \rfloor$ and $\lceil np \rceil$. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the event that $|X_i| < np - 1$ for all $i \in [1, m]$. Since the number of vertices attached to each attribute is independent,

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{S}] = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \Big(1 - \mathbb{P}\big[\, X_i \geq np - 1 \,\big]\Big) \leq \big(1 - (1 - 1/2)\big)^m = 2^{-m}.$$

Now, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{S}] = 0$, and w.h.p. G contains a clique of size $np - 1 = \gamma n^{(1-\alpha)/2} - 1$, and thus has degeneracy at least $np - 1$. □

Corollary 1. *Fix constants $\alpha < 1, \beta$ and γ. If $m = \beta n^{\alpha}$ and $p = \gamma n^{-(1+\alpha)/2}$, then w.h.p. $G(n, m, p)$ is somewhere dense.*

Proof. The proof of Lemma 3 shows that w.h.p. a clique of size $\gamma n^{(1-\alpha)/2}$ exists already as a subgraph (i.e. a 0-subdivision) in every $G \in G(n, m, p)$. □

The following lemma addresses the case when the attributes grow at the same rate as the number of nodes. We note that Bloznelis and Kurauskas independently proved a similar result (using a slightly different RIG model) in [6]; we include a slightly more direct proof here for completeness.

Lemma 4. *Fix constants $\alpha = 1, \beta$ and γ. Then a random graph $G = G(n, m, p)$ has degeneracy $\Omega(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n})$ w.h.p..*

Proof. Let c be any constant greater than one. We will show that for every $k \leq \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$, a random graph $G \in G(n, m, p)$ contains a clique of size k with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-c})$. Fix an attribute a. The probability that a has degree at least k in the bipartite graph is at least the probability that it is *exactly* k, hence

$$\binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} \geq \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^n \geq \frac{\gamma^k}{e^{\gamma} k^k}. \tag{1}$$

We will show that this converges fast enough for $\gamma < 1$; the case for $\gamma \geq 1$ works analogously. Therefore the probability that none of the $m = \beta n$ attributes has degree at least k is at most

$$\left(1 - \frac{\gamma^k}{e^{\gamma} k^k}\right)^{\beta n} \leq e^{-\beta n \left(\frac{\gamma^k}{e^{\gamma} k^k}\right)}. \tag{2}$$

We prove that this probability is smaller than n^{-c} by showing that

$$\frac{\beta}{e^{\gamma}} \frac{n \gamma^k}{k^k} \geq c \cdot \log n, \tag{3}$$

when $k = \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$. Let $c' = ce^{\gamma}/\beta$. Then to show (3) holds, it is enough to show

$$n \frac{(\gamma \log \log n)^{\log n / \log \log n}}{(\log n)^{\log n / \log \log n}} = (\gamma \log \log n)^{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}} \geq c' \cdot \log n. \tag{4}$$

Comparing the functions $e^{x/\log x}$ and $c'x$, we see that for large enough positive x,

$$x > \log c' \log x + \log^2 x$$

and equivalently

$$e^{x/\log x} > c' \cdot x.$$

Therefore for large enough n, $e^{\log n / \log \log n} > c' \cdot \log n$, and in particular, for $n > e^{e^{e/\gamma}}$,

$$(\gamma \log \log n)^{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}} \geq c' \cdot \log n,$$

as claimed. This shows the probability that no attribute has degree at least $\log n / \log \log n$ is at most $O(n^{-c})$, and the claim follows. □

Corollary 2. *Fix constants $\alpha = 1, \beta$ and γ. If $m = \beta n^{\alpha}$ and $p = \gamma n^{-(1+\alpha)/2}$, then w.h.p. $G(n, m, p)$ is somewhere dense.*

Proof. Lemma 4 is proven by showing that w.h.p. a clique of size $\Omega(\log n/(\log\log n))$ exists as a subgraph (i.e. a 0-subdivision) in every graph in $G(n, m, p)$. □

3.2 The regime $\alpha > 1$.

This subsection is dedicated to the proof of the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Fix positive constants $\alpha > 1$, β and γ. Then w.h.p. the class of random intersection graphs $G(n, m, p)$ defined by these constants has bounded expansion.*

We proof Theorem 2 by showing that the the two conditions of Proposition 1 are satisfied. These results are contained in Lemma 9 and Lemma 10 below. Before that, we need to introduce several technical results that will ultimately lead up to these two lemmas

Bounded Attribute-Degrees As mentioned before, for a random intersection graph to be degenerate, the attributes of the associated bipartite graph must have bounded degree. We prove that w.h.p., this necessary condition is satisfied.

Lemma 5. *Let $c \geq 1$ be a constant such that $2\frac{\alpha+c}{\alpha-1} > \beta\gamma e$. Then the probability that there exists an attribute in the bipartite graph associated with $G(n, m, p)$ of degree higher than $2\frac{\alpha+c}{\alpha-1}$ is $O(n^{-c})$.*

Proof. Taking the union bound, the probability that some attribute has degree larger than d is upper bounded by

$$m\binom{n}{d}p^d \leq \frac{\beta e^d \gamma^d}{d^d} \cdot \frac{n^{\alpha+d}}{n^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}d}},$$

where the first fraction is bounded by a constant as soon as $d > e\beta\gamma$. Then we achieve an upper bound of $O(n^{-c})$ as soon as $\frac{\alpha+1}{2}d - d - \alpha > c$, or equivalently, $d > 2\frac{\alpha+c}{\alpha-1}$, proving the claim. □

This allows us to assume for the remainder of the proof that the maximum attribute degree is bounded.

Stable r-Subdivisions In order to disprove the existence of an r-shallow topological minor of a certain density δ, we introduce a stronger topological structure.

Definition 7 (Stable r-subdivision). *Given graphs G, H we say that G* contains *H* as a stable *r*-subdivision *if G contains H as a $\frac{r}{2}$-shallow topological minor with model G' such that every path in G' corresponding to an edge in H has exactly length $r + 1$ and is an induced path in G.*

A stable r-subdivision is by definition a shallow topological minor, thus the existence of an r-subdivision of density δ implies that $\widetilde{\nabla}_{\frac{r}{2}}(G) \geq \delta$. We prove that the densities are also related in the other direction.

Lemma 6. *A graph G with $\widetilde{\nabla}_{\frac{r}{2}}(G) \geq \delta$ contains a stable i-subdivision of density at least $\delta/(r+1)$ for some $i \in \{0, \ldots, r\}$.*

Proof. Consider a $\frac{r}{2}$-shallow topological minor H of G with density at least δ. Let $H' \subseteq G$ be the model of H and let $\lambda\colon V(H') \to V(H) \cup E(H)$ be a mapping that maps nails of the model to vertices of the minor and subdivision vertices of the model to their respective edge in the model. Consider the preimage λ^{-1}. As a slight abuse of notation, we can consider λ^{-1} as a map to (possibly empty) paths of H: indeed, we can assume that every edge of H is mapped by λ^{-1} to an *induced* path in H'. If H' uses any non-induced paths, we can replace each such path a by a (shorter) induced path and obtain a (different) model of H with the desired property.

We partition the edges of H by the length of their respective paths in the model: define $E_\ell = \{e \in H \mid |\lambda^{-1}(e)| = \ell\}$ for $0 \leq \ell \leq r+1$. Since $|E(H)| = \bigcup_{0 \leq \ell \leq r+1} |E_\ell| \geq \delta |V(H)|$, there exists at least one set E_ℓ such that $|E_\ell| \geq \delta |V(H)|/(r+1)$. Then the subgraph $(V(H), E_\ell)$ is a stable ℓ-subdivision of G. □

To show that a graph has no r-shallow minor of density δ, it now suffices to prove that no stable i-subdivision of density $\delta/(2r+1)$ exists for any $i \in \{0, \ldots, 2r\}$. Let us now establish the probability of having such a structure appear in the random intersection graph model. We note that the following structural result is surprisingly useful, and appears to have promising applications beyond our work here.

Theorem 3. *Let $c \geq 1$ be a constant, $\Delta := 2\frac{\alpha+c}{\alpha-1}$, and $\phi = (6e\Delta\beta\gamma r\delta)^{5r\delta\frac{2}{(\alpha-1)}}$. Assuming that no attribute has degree greater than Δ, the probability that $G(n, m, p)$ contains a stable r-subdivision with k nails for $r \geq 1$ and of density $\delta > 1$ is at most $r\delta k \cdot (\phi/n)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}k}$.*

Proof. Let us first bound the probability that the bipartite graph associated with $G = G(n, m, p)$ contains a dense subgraph. We will then argue that a dense subdivision in G implies the existence of such a dense bipartite subgraph.

Let $\mathbb{P}_{\text{dense}}(\kappa, \nu, \lambda)$ be the probability that there exists sets $V' \subseteq V$, $A' \subseteq A$, of size κ and ν respectively, such that there exist at least λ edges between nodes of V' and A'. It is easy to see that this probability is bounded by

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{dense}}(\kappa, \nu, \lambda) \leq \binom{n}{\kappa}\binom{m}{\nu} \sum_{d_1, \ldots, d_\nu} \prod_{i=1}^{\nu} \binom{\kappa}{d_i} p^{d_i}, \tag{5}$$

where $d_1, \ldots, d_\nu$ represent all possible choices of the degrees of ν attributes such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} d_i = \lambda$. By Lemma 5, w.h.p. $d_i \leq \Delta$ and thus w.h.p. there are at most

Δ^ν terms in the sum of (5). Using this together with Stirling's approximation allows us to simplify the bound as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{dense}}(\kappa,\nu,\lambda) \leq \left(\frac{ne}{\kappa}\right)^\kappa \left(\frac{\Delta me}{\nu}\right)^\nu (\kappa ep)^\lambda = \frac{e^{\kappa+\nu+\lambda}\Delta^\nu \beta^\nu \gamma^\lambda}{\nu^\nu} \frac{\kappa^\lambda n^{\alpha\nu+\kappa}}{\kappa^\kappa n^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}\lambda}}. \tag{6}$$

Consider a stable r-subdivision H in G with k nails and density δ. The model of H uses exactly $k + r\delta k$ vertices of G. Let A_H be a minimal set of attributes that generates the edges of the model of H in G. There is at least one edge between every nail and an attribute in A_H. Furthermore, since the paths connecting the nails in the model are induced, every subdivision vertex has at least two edges to the attributes A_H. We conclude that there exists a bipartite subgraph with $\kappa = k + r\delta k$ and $\lambda = 2r\delta k + k$. Since A_H is minimal, every attribute of A_H generates at least one edge in the model of H and therefore $|A_H| \leq (r+1)\delta k$. Let $\delta_1 = (r\delta + 1)$ and $\delta_2 = (2r\delta + 1)$. By the bound in Equation (6), the probability of such a structure is at most

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\nu=r\delta k/\Delta}^{r\delta k} \mathbb{P}_{\text{dense}}(\delta_1 k, \nu, \delta_2 k) \qquad (7)\\ \leq &\sum_{\nu=r\delta k/\Delta}^{r\delta k} \frac{e^{\delta_1 k+\nu+\delta_2 k}\Delta^\nu \beta^\nu \gamma^{\delta_2 k}}{\nu^\nu (\delta_2 k)^{\delta_2 k}} \frac{(\delta_1 k)^{\delta_2 k} n^{\alpha\nu+\delta_1 k}}{(\delta_1 k)^{\delta_1 k} n^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}\delta_2 k}} \end{aligned}$$

Let ψ be the exponent of $1/n$ in a term of this sum. Then we have

$$\psi = \frac{\alpha+1}{2}\delta_2 k - (\alpha\nu + \delta_1 k) = \frac{\alpha+1}{2}(2r\delta+1)k - (\alpha\nu + (r\delta+1)k).$$

Simplifying, we see that

$$\psi = \frac{\alpha-1}{2}k + \alpha(r\delta k - \nu).$$

Thus we can rewrite the inequaliy in (7) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\nu=r\delta k/\Delta}^{r\delta k} \mathbb{P}_{\text{dense}}(\delta_1 k, \nu, \delta_2 k)\\ \leq &\sum_{\nu=r\delta k/\Delta}^{r\delta k} \frac{e^{\delta_1 k+\nu+\delta_2 k}\Delta^\nu \beta^\nu \gamma^{\delta_2 k} {\delta_1}^{\delta_2 k}}{{\delta_1}^{\delta_1 k}} \frac{k^{\delta_2 k}}{\nu^\nu k^{\delta_1 k} n^{\alpha(r\delta k-\nu)}} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}k}}\\ \leq &\left(\frac{e^{\delta_1+r\delta+\delta_2}\Delta^{r\delta}\beta^{r\delta}\gamma^{\delta_2}{\delta_1}^{\delta_2}}{{\delta_1}^{\delta_1}}\right)^k \sum_{\nu=r\delta k/\Delta}^{r\delta k} \frac{k^{\delta_2 k}}{\nu^\nu k^{\delta_1 k} n^{\alpha(r\delta k-\nu)}} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}k}}\\ \leq &\left(\frac{e^{\delta_1+r\delta+\delta_2}\Delta^{2r\delta}\beta^{r\delta}\gamma^{\delta_2}{\delta_1}^{\delta_2}}{{\delta_1}^{\delta_1}}\right)^k \sum_{\nu=r\delta k/\Delta}^{r\delta k} \frac{k^{\delta_2 k}}{(r\delta k)^\nu k^{\delta_1 k} k^{\alpha(r\delta k-\nu)}} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}k}}\\ \leq &\left(e^{\delta_1+r\delta+\delta_2}\Delta^{2r\delta}\beta^{r\delta}\gamma^{\delta_2}{\delta_1}^{\delta_2}\right)^k \sum_{\nu=r\delta k/\Delta}^{r\delta k} \frac{k^{\delta_2 k}}{k^\nu k^{\delta_1 k} k^{\alpha(r\delta k-\nu)}} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}k}} \end{aligned}$$

Let ψ' be the exponent of k in a term of this sum. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi' &= \delta_2 k - \nu - \delta_1 k - \alpha(r\delta k) + \alpha\nu \\ &= (1-\alpha)(r\delta k) + (\alpha-1)\nu \\ &\leq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Using ϕ as defined, we arrive at the following inequality.

$$\sum_{\nu=r\delta k/\Delta}^{r\delta k} \mathbb{P}_{\text{dense}}(\delta_1 k, \nu, \delta_2 k) \leq \phi^{\frac{(\alpha-1)}{2}k} \sum_{\nu=r\delta k/\Delta}^{r\delta k} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}k}} \leq r\delta k \cdot \left(\frac{\phi}{n}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}k}$$

This completes our proof. □

Density Before turning to the proof of Theorem 2, we need two more lemmas that establish the probability that $G(n, m, p)$ contains special types of dense subgraphs.

Lemma 7. *Let $c \geq 1$ be a constant and let $\Delta := 2\frac{\alpha+c}{\alpha-1}$. For $u \leq m, k \leq n$, the probability that the bipartite graph associated with $G(n, m, p)$ contains u attributes of degree $\leq \Delta$ that generate at least $\rho \geq u$ edges between k fixed vertices is at most*

$$\left(\frac{e^{\Delta+1}\gamma^{\Delta}\Delta\beta}{u/k}\right)^{u}\left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{u}.$$

Before we provide a proof, we note that it is perhaps surprising that ρ disappears in the upper bound given above. Since we are assuming that the degree of the attributes is bounded by Δ, the number of attributes u must be at least $\rho/\binom{\Delta}{2}$. Thus the ρ reappears upon expansion. Since we can bound the degree of the attributes w.h.p. when $\alpha > 1$ this theorem is generally applicable to sparse random intersection graphs.

Proof. The probability that u attributes of maximal degree Δ generate at least $\rho \geq u$ edges between k fixed vertices can be upper-bounded by

$$\binom{m}{u} \sum_{d_1,\ldots,d_u} \prod_{i=1}^{u} \binom{k}{d_i} p^{d_i}, \tag{8}$$

where $d_1, \ldots, d_u$ represent all possible choices of the degrees of u attributes such that $\sum_{i=1}^{u} \binom{d_i}{2} \geq \rho$, i.e. the degrees of the chosen attributes can generate enough edges. Let $D = \sum_{i=1}^{u} d_i$. The following bound follows from Stirling's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}\binom{m}{u} \sum_{d_1,\ldots,d_u} \prod_{i=1}^{u} \binom{k}{d_i} p^{d_i} &\leq \frac{(e\beta n^{\alpha})^u}{u^u} \sum_{d_1,\ldots,d_u} \prod_{i=1}^{u} \frac{(ek)^{d_i}}{d_i^{d_i}} \left(\frac{\gamma}{n^{(\alpha+1)/2}}\right)^{d_i} \\ &= \frac{(e\beta)^u n^{\alpha u}}{u^u} \sum_{d_1,\ldots,d_u} \frac{e^D k^D}{\prod_{i=1}^{u} d_i^{d_i}} \frac{\gamma^D}{n^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}D}} \\ &\leq \frac{(e\beta)^u (e\gamma)^{\Delta u} n^{\alpha u}}{u^u} \sum_{d_1,\ldots,d_u} \frac{k^D}{n^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}D}}\end{aligned}$$

Since each d_i is smaller or equal to Δ, we can bound this term from above by

$$\begin{aligned}\binom{m}{u}\sum_{d_1,\dots,d_u}\prod_{i=1}^{u}\binom{k}{d_i}p^{d_i} &\leq \frac{(e^{\Delta+1}\gamma^{\Delta}\beta)^u n^{\alpha u}}{u^u}\cdot\sum_{d_1,\dots,d_u}\frac{k^D}{n^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}D}}\\ &= \left(\frac{e^{\Delta+1}\gamma^{\Delta}\beta}{u/k}\right)^u\sum_{d_1,\dots,d_u}\frac{n^{\alpha u}k^{D-u}}{n^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}D}}.\end{aligned}$$

We want to show that $(n^{\alpha u}k^{D-u})/(n^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}D})$ is bounded by $(k/n)^x$ for some $x \geq u$. We first look at the following inequality:

$$\left(\frac{\alpha+1}{2}\right)D - \alpha u \geq D - u \Leftrightarrow D \geq 2u$$

Notice that an attribute of degree one generates no edges, thus we can assume that all $d_i \geq 2$. It follows that $D \geq 2u$ and thus the inequality holds. It follows that

$$(n^{\alpha u}k^{D-u})/(n^{\frac{\alpha+1}{2}D}) \leq \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{D-u} \leq \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^u$$

The probability of u attributes generating at least ρ edges between k vertices is then at most

$$\binom{m}{u}\sum_{d_1,\dots,d_u}\binom{k}{d_i}p^{d_i} \leq \left(\frac{e^{\Delta+1}\gamma^{\Delta}\beta}{u/k}\right)^u\sum_{d_1,\dots,d_u}\left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^u.$$

Finally, since any d_i can be at most Δ we can get rid of the sum by multiplying with a Δ^u factor:

$$\left(\frac{e^{\Delta+1}\gamma^{\Delta}\beta}{u/k}\right)^u\sum_{d_1,\dots,d_u}\left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^u \leq \left(\frac{e^{\Delta+1}\gamma^{\Delta}\Delta\beta}{u/k}\right)^u\left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^u$$

□

The following Lemma is a rather straightforward consequence of Lemma 7.

Lemma 8. *Let $c \geq 1$ be a constant, $\Delta := 2\frac{\alpha+c}{\alpha-1}$ and $\delta > e^{\Delta+1}\gamma^{\Delta}\Delta^3\beta$. Then the probability that $G(n,m,p)$ contains a subgraph of density δ on k nodes is at most $\delta k(k/n)^{\delta k/\Delta^2}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5 we can disregard any graph whose associated bipartite graph has an attribute of degree greater than Δ. We can bound the probability by:

$$\sum_{u=\frac{\delta k}{\Delta^2}}^{\delta k}\binom{m}{u}\sum_{d_1,\dots,d_u}\binom{k}{d_i}p^{d_i} \tag{9}$$

where $d_1, \ldots, d_u$ represent the degrees of the u attributes such $\sum_{i=1}^{u} \binom{d_i}{2} \geq \delta k$ (i.e. the degrees of the u attributes that generate all direct edges).

Using Lemma 7, the right hand side of Equation (9) is bounded by

$$\sum_{u=\frac{\delta k}{\Delta^2}}^{\delta k} \left(\frac{e^{\Delta+1}\gamma^{\Delta}\Delta\beta}{u/k}\right)^{u} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{u} \leq \sum_{u=\frac{\delta k}{\Delta^2}}^{\delta k} \left(\frac{e^{\Delta+1}\gamma^{\Delta}\Delta^3\beta}{\delta}\right)^{u} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{u},$$

using the fact that $u/k \geq \delta/\Delta^2$. Since by assumption $\delta \geq e^{\Delta+1}\gamma^{\Delta}\Delta^3\beta$, we can cancel these terms and simplify the above to

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{direct}} \leq \sum_{u=\frac{\delta k}{\Delta^2}}^{\delta k} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{u} \leq \delta k \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{\frac{\delta k}{\Delta^2}}$$

using the fact that k/n is smaller than one. □

We are finally in a position to prove that in the regime $\alpha > 1$, the two conditions of Proposition 1 are satified.

Lemma 9. *Let $c \geq 1$ be a constant, $\Delta := 2\frac{\alpha+c}{\alpha-1}$, and λ be a constant bigger than $\max\{2e^{\Delta+2}\gamma^{\Delta}\Delta\beta,\ c\}$. For $G = \mathcal{G}(n, m, p)$ and for all $\epsilon > 0$ it holds with probability $O(n^{-c})$ that $|V(G)|^{-1} \cdot |\{v \in V(G)\colon \deg(v) \geq \frac{2\lambda\Delta^2}{\epsilon}\}| \leq \epsilon$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5 we can disregard all bipartite graphs that have an attribute of degree greater than Δ. Suppose that for some ϵ there exists a vertex set S of size greater than ϵn in which all vertices have degree at least $2\lambda\Delta^2/\epsilon$. This implies that there exists a set F of edges of size at least $\frac{\epsilon n}{2}\frac{2\lambda\Delta^2}{\epsilon} = \lambda\Delta^2 \cdot n$ whose members each have at least one endpoint in S. Further, since every attribute has degree at most Δ and thus it generates at most Δ^2 edges, there exists a set $F' \subseteq F$ such that

(i) $|F'| \geq |F|/\Delta^2 = \lambda n$,
(ii) and every $e \in F'$ is generated by at least one attribute that generates no other edge in F'.

The existence of F' follows from a simple greedy procedure: Pick any edge from F and a corresponding attribute, then discard at most Δ^2 edges generated by this attribute. Repeat.

We now bound the probability there exists such a set F': Since F' is generated by exactly $|F'| = \lambda n$ attributes, we can apply Lemma 7 to obtain the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \binom{n}{k} \left(\frac{e^{\Delta+1}\gamma^{\Delta}\Delta\beta \cdot k}{\lambda n}\right)^{\lambda n} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{\lambda n} &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\frac{e^{\Delta+1}\gamma^{\Delta}\Delta\beta}{\lambda}\right)^{\lambda n} \frac{n^k e^k}{k^k} \frac{k^{2\lambda n}}{n^{2\lambda n}} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{e^{\Delta+2}\gamma^{\Delta}\Delta\beta}{\lambda}\right)^{\lambda n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{2\lambda n-k}\end{aligned}$$

By the choice of λ, this expression is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{2^{\lambda n}} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{2\lambda n - k} \leq \frac{n}{2^{\lambda n}}$$

since every element of the sum is smaller than one and the statement follows. Note that $n/2^{\lambda n} < 1/n^c$ since $\lambda > c$, i.e. this probability converges faster than the one proven in Lemma 5. □

To prove Theorem 2 it just remains to show that the second condition of Proposition 1 holds, which we do in the next and final lemma.

Lemma 10. *Let $c \geq 1$ be a constant, $\Delta := 2\frac{\alpha+c}{\alpha-1}$, $\Delta^2 := \binom{\Delta}{2}$, ϕ be defined as in Theorem 3 and $\delta_r > (2r+1) \cdot \max\{e^{\Delta+1}\gamma^{\Delta}\Delta\Delta^2\beta,\ (c+1)\Delta^2\}$. Then for every $r \in \mathbf{N}^+$, for every $0 < \epsilon < e^{-3}$, and for every $H \subseteq G = G(n,m,p)$ with $|H| < \epsilon n$ it holds with probability $O(n^{-c})$ that $\widetilde{\nabla}_r(H) \geq \delta_r$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5 we can disregard any graph whose associated bipartite graph has an attribute of degree greater than Δ. By Lemma 6 if G contains an r-shallow topological minor of density δ_r then for some $i \in \{0, \ldots, 2r\}$ there exists a stable i-subdivision of density $\delta_r/(2r+1)$. We can then bound the probability of a r-shallow topological minor by bounding the probability of a stable i-subdivision of density $\delta_r/(2r+1)$.

From Lemma 8 we know that the probability of a 0-shallow topological minor on k nails is bounded by

$$\binom{n}{k} \delta_r k \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{\frac{\delta_r k}{\Delta^2}}.$$

By Theorem 3, the probability for an i-subdivision of density $\delta_r/(2r+1)$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, 2r\}$ is bounded by $r\delta_r k \cdot (\phi/n)^{k(\alpha-1)/2}$. Taking the union bound of these two events gives us a total bound of

$$\binom{n}{k} \delta_r k \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{\frac{\delta_r k}{\Delta^2}} + (2r+1) r \delta_r k \cdot \left(\frac{\phi}{n}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}k} \tag{10}$$

for the probability of a dense subgraph or subdivision on k vertices to appear. Taking the union bound over all k we obtain for the first summand that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\epsilon n} \binom{n}{k} \delta_r k \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{\frac{\delta_r k}{\Delta^2}} \leq \delta_r \sum_{k=1}^{\epsilon n} \frac{n^k e^k}{k^k} \frac{k^{(c+1)k+1}}{n^{(c+1)k}}. \tag{11}$$

Since δ_r is a constant, it suffices that the sum in (11) is in $O(n^{-c})$. We will show this is bounded by a geometric sum by considering the ratio of two consecutive summands:

$$\frac{e^{k+1}(k+1)^{c(k+1)+1}}{n^{c(k+1)}} \frac{n^{ck}}{e^k k^{ck+1}} = e \frac{(k(1+1/k))^{ck+c+1}}{n^c k^{ck+1}} \leq e^{2c+1} \frac{k^c}{n^c} \leq e^{2c+1}\epsilon^c.$$

Here we used the fact that $(1+1/k)^{ck+c+1} \leq e^c(1+1/k)^{c+1}$ and that $(1+1/k)^{c+1} \leq e^c$ for $k \geq 2$ and $c \geq 1$.

Since this is smaller than one when $\epsilon < e^{-2}$ and $c \geq 1$, the summands decrease geometrically. Hence its largest element (i.e. the summand for $k = 1$) dominates the total value of the sum, more precisely, there exists a constant ξ (depending on α and c) such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\epsilon n} \frac{e^k k^{ck+1}}{n^{ck}} \leq \xi \frac{e}{n^c} = O(n^{-c}). \tag{12}$$

We now turn to the second summand. It is easy to see by the same methods as before that this sum is also geometric for $n > \phi^{(\alpha+1)/2}$ and as such there exists a constant ξ' which multiplied with the first element bounds the sum. An r-shallow topological minor of density δ_r has at least $2\delta_r$ nails, thus we can assume $k \geq 2\delta_r$. Since $\delta_r > (c+1)\Delta^2 \geq c/(\alpha-1)$, we have:

$$\sum_{k=2\delta_r}^{\epsilon n} (2r+1)r\delta_r k \cdot \left(\frac{\phi}{n}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{2}k} \leq \frac{\xi'(2r+1)\phi^{\delta_r}}{n^{(\alpha-1)\delta_r}} \leq \frac{\xi'(2r+1)\phi^{\delta_r}}{n^c} = O(n^{-c}). \tag{13}$$

Combining (12) and (13), Equation (10) is bounded by $O(n^{-c})$, as claimed. □

4 Preliminary Results on Practicality

We have now proven that when $\alpha > 1$ the model has bounded expansion w.h.p.. A natural question is if this can be exploited in practice, which depends on the behavior of the expansion function. Consider, for example, random intersection graphs generated with parameters $c = 1$, $\alpha = 1.5$, $\gamma = 5$ and $\beta = 0.1$ (selected to be relatively realistic and enable easy generation). Here, the δ_r derived in Lemma 10 (which proves the class has bounded expansion) is at least 10^{13} (independent of r). Since all tools for classes of bounded expansion depend heavily on the behavior of the expansion function and the expansion function given by the framework in [22] will depend on δ_r, this upper bound is not enough to show practical applicability. A natural question is whether such a large δ_r is necessary (i.e. is the construction giving us a function close to the actual expansion?). We provide empirical evidence (using the aforementioned class of random intersection graphs), that the upper bound is not tight, improving the prospects for these associated tools. Specifically, we calculate so-called *low treewidth colorings*, which can be used to characterize classes of bounded expansion.

Proposition 2 (Low treewidth colorings [22]). *A graph class $\mathcal{G}$ has bounded expansion if and only if there exists a function f such that for every $G \in \mathcal{G}$, $k \in \mathbf{N}$, the graph G can be colored with $f(k)$ colors so that any $i < k$ color classes induce a graph of treewidth $\leq i$ in G. This coloring can be computed in linear time.*



Fig. 1. Median of low treewidth coloring sizes of random intersection graphs with $\alpha = 1.5$, $\beta = 0.1$ and $\gamma = 5$ over ten graphs for each size

The characterization can be made stronger (the colorings are actually low *treedepth* colorings), but this is not important in this context.

We implemented a simple version of the linear time coloring algorithm and ran it on ten random intersection graphs ($n \in \{500, 1000, \ldots, 6000, 7000, \ldots, 10000, 15000, 20.000, 25.000\}$) with parameters $\alpha = 1.5$, $\gamma = 5$ and $\beta = 0.1$ and took the median over the number of colors used by the algorithm. The results of this experiment can be seen in Figure 1. Our results earlier in this section predict a horizontal asymptote for every k. We can see a surprisingly small bound for $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. Even for $k = 5$ the plot starts flattening quickly. It should be noted that the colorings given by this simple approximation algorithm are very likely to be far from optimal. This result indicates that the graphs modeled by random intersection are amenable to algorithms based on low treewidth colorings (which usually perform dynamic programming computations that depend exponentially on the number of colors). Further, by the known relation between low treewidth colorings and the expansion function, this indicates that these graphs have reasonable expansion bounds.

5 Hyperbolicity

We now turn to the question of whether the structure of the shortest-path distances in random intersection graphs is tree-like (using Gromov's δ-hyperbolicity as defined in Section 2.3) where we establish a negative result by giving a logarithmic lower bound, for all values of α. Our approach is based on a special type of path, which gives natural lower bounds on the hyperbolicity.

Definition 8. *Let $G = G(n, m, p)$ be a random intersection graph. The k-path $P = v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{k+1}$ in G is called a* k-special path *if all the internal vertices of P have degree two in G and there exists another disjoint path connecting v_1 and v_{k+1} in G. We allow for the second path to have length 0: this occurs if P is a k-cycle such that all but one vertex of P has degree two in G.*

Lemma 11. *Let k be a positive integer and $G = G(n, m, p)$. If G contains a k-special path, then G has hyperbolicity at least $\lfloor \frac{k}{4} \rfloor$.*

Proof. Let P be a k-special path in G. By definition, P is part of some cycle C of length at least k. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that the length of C is exactly k. Then, $v = v_1$, satisfies

$$\forall u \in P_G[v_{\lfloor k/4 \rfloor}, v_{\lceil k/2 \rceil}] \cup P_G[v_{\lceil k/2 \rceil}, v_{\lceil 3k/4 \rceil}], \;\; |u - v|_G \geq \lfloor k/4 \rfloor. \tag{14}$$

As $v_1 \in P[v_{\lfloor k/4 \rfloor}, v_{\lceil 3k/4 \rceil}]$, this shows the hyperbolicity of G is at least $\lfloor k/4 \rfloor$. □

Showing that these structures exist in an intersection graph is non-trivial, but crucial for our proof of the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *Fix constants α, β and γ such that $\gamma^2 \beta > 1$. There exists a constant $\xi > 0$ such that a.a.s., the random intersection graph $G = G(n, m, p)$ with $m = \beta n^\alpha$ and $p = \gamma n^{-(1+\alpha/2)}$ has hyperbolicity*

(i) at least $\xi \log n$ when $\alpha \geq 1$,
(ii) $(1 \pm o(1))\xi \log n$ otherwise.

For convenience we split the proof of Theorem 4 into Lemmas 12, 13, and 14 for the cases when α is greater, equal, and less than 1, respectively.

Recall that to get a lower bound on the hyperbolicity of G, it is enough to find a k-special path in G. We will restrict our attention to a particular kind of k-special path inside the giant component of G.

Definition 9 (k-special bipartite path). *Let $G = G(n, m, p)$ and B be the associated bipartite graph, fix $X \subset V$ and $Y \subset A$. Letting B' be the subgraph of B induced by $V \setminus X$ and $A \setminus Y$, we consider a connected component C in B' (later we will restrict to the case when C is the giant component.) We are interested in paths $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{2k-1}$ in B such that v_1, v_{2k-1} are both elements of $A \setminus Y$ and all the other vertices of the path belong to $X \cup Y$. We will restrict our attention to those paths where v_1 and v_{2k-1} are both adjacent to vertices of C. Such a path in B will correspond to a k-special path in G if the following three conditions hold:*

(i) $N_B(v_1) \cap X = \{v_2\}$ and $N_B(v_{2k-1}) \cap X = \{v_{2k-2}\}$,
(ii) for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-2$, $N_B(v_{2i+1}) = \{v_{2i}, v_{2i+2}\}$,
(iii) for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$, $N_B(v_{2i}) \cap N_B(V \setminus \{v_{2i}\}) = \{v_{2i-1}, v_{2i+1}\}$,

We call such paths k-special bipartite paths on (X, Y, C).

Note that when there is no chance of confusion, we may drop X, Y and C from our notation and merely refer to "k-special bipartite paths."

Lemma 12. *Fix positive constants $\alpha > 1$ and β, γ, such that $\beta\gamma^2 > 1$. Then there exists a constant $\xi > 0$ such that a.a.s. $G \in G(n, m, p)$ has hyperbolicity at least $\xi \log n$.*

Proof. As $nmp^2 > 1$ and $\alpha > 1$, we can pick $\zeta > 0$ such that $(1-\zeta)^2 nmp^2 > 1$. Let $X \subset V$ be a random subset of size ζn and $Y \subset A$ of size ζm. Consider exposing (or inspecting) the edges of B incident with $V \setminus X$ and $A \setminus Y$ – that is, determine exactly which pairs in $(V \setminus X) \times (A \setminus Y)$ are edges in B. Suppose however, that we do not inspect the edges of B incident with either X or Y. We now have a subgraph of G on $V \setminus X$. We call this subgraph the "*exposed graph.*" Due to our choice of ζ, a.a.s., the exposed graph has a giant component of size at least δn where the constant $\delta = \delta(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, x, n_0)$ for all $n \geq n_0$ [2]. Conditioning on this (likely) event, let C be the giant component of the exposed graph.

Instead of finding (and counting) k-special paths in G, it will be convenient to look for k-special bipartite paths on (X, Y, C). While each k-special bipartite path in B corresponds to a k-special path in G, this correspondence is not one-to-one. However, this is not a problem as ultimately we will be interested in showing that for an appropriate value of k, there is at least one k-special path in G a.a.s..

Let S_k denote the number of k-special bipartite paths, and recall that we are conditioning on the fact that the exposed graph has a giant component of size at least δn. The distribution of S_k depends on n, m, p, ζ and δ. We approximate the first two moments of S_k and then maximize k under the constraint that a.a.s. $S_k > 0$. Suppose that v_1 and v_{2k-1} belong to $A \setminus Y$ such that v_1 and v_{2k-1} both have neighbors in C. Suppose further that the vertices $\{v_{2i+1}\}_{i=1}^{k-2} \subseteq Y$ and the vertices $\{v_{2i}\}_{i=1}^{k-1} \subseteq X$. Denote the probability these vertices form a k-special path $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{2k-1}$ by p_k.

It will be convenient to break up the event that the vertices form a k-special bipartite path into smaller events. In particular, let $\mathbf{P}$ be the event that $B|_{v_1, v_2 \ldots, v_{2k-1}}$ is exactly a $2k-2$ path on $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{2k-1}$. Let $\mathbf{N_1}$ be the event that

$$N_B(v_1) \cap X = \{v_2\}$$

and $\mathbf{N_{2k-1}}$ the event that

$$N_B(v_{2k-1}) \cap X = \{v_{2k-2}\}.$$

Together, these two events correspond to Condition (i) in the definition of k-special bipartite paths. For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-2$ define $\mathbf{N_{2i+1}}$ to be the event

$$N_B(v_{2i+1}) = \{v_{2i}, v_{2i+2}\}.$$

Collectively, these correspond to Condition (ii) in the definition of k-special bipartite paths. Finally for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-2$ define $\mathbf{N_{2i}}$ to be the event

$$N_B(v_{2i}) \cap N_B(V \setminus \{v_{2i}, v_{2(i+1)}, \ldots, v_{2(k-1)}\}) = \{v_{2i-1}\}$$

and $\mathbf{N_{2k-2}}$ to be the event that $N_B(v_{2i}) \cap N_B(V \setminus \{v_{2i}\}) = \{v_{2i-1}, v_{2i+1}\}$. The event $\bigwedge_{i=2,4,\ldots,2k-2} \mathbf{N_i}$ is equivalent to Condition (iii). By Lemma 1, w.h.p.

$$\left|N_B(V \setminus \{v_{2i}, v_{2(i+1)}, \ldots, v_{2(k-1)}\})\right| \leq (1+\epsilon nmp)$$

holds for each $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$. Thus w.h.p., for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mathbf{N_{2i}} \,\middle|\, \mathbf{P} \bigwedge_{j=1}^{2i-1} \mathbf{N_j}\right] \geq \left((1-p)^{(1+\epsilon)nmp}\right)^{k-1}. \tag{15}$$

On the other hand, it is clear that $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{P}] = p^{2k-2}$ and for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k-2$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mathbf{N_{2i+1}} \,\middle|\, \mathbf{P} \bigwedge_{j=1}^{2i} \mathbf{N_j}\right] = (1-p)^{n-(k-1)}. \tag{16}$$

Since we know that

$$p_k = \mathbb{P}\left[\mathbf{P} \bigwedge_{i=1}^{2k-1} \mathbf{N_i}\right] = \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{P}] \prod_{i=1}^{2k-1} \mathbb{P}\left[\mathbf{N_i} \,\middle|\, \mathbf{P} \bigwedge_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbf{N_j}\right],$$

we can substitute from Equations 15 and 16 to get a lower bound for p_k of

$$\begin{aligned} &p^{2k-2}(1-p)^{k^2-3k+2}\left((1-p)^{|X|-(k-1)}\right)^2 \\ &\quad \cdot \left((1-p)^{n-(k-1)}\right)^{k-2}\left((1-p)^{(1+\epsilon)nmp}\right)^{k-1} \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

which simplifies to

$$p_k \geq p^{2k-2}(1-p)^{(1+\epsilon)(k-1)nmp+(2\zeta+k-2)n-2k+2}. \tag{18}$$

Using the inequality $1-p \geq \exp(-2p)$ (which holds for small enough p), we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_k &\geq p^{2k-2}\exp\left[-(2p)[(1+\epsilon)(k-1)nmp + (2\zeta+k-2)n - 2k + 2]\right] \\ &\geq p^{2k-2}\exp\left[-(1+2\epsilon)(k-1)2\beta\gamma^2\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

We now count the number of ways, N_k, in which a k-special path could occur in G. By Lemma 1, w.h.p., the number of attributes adjacent to vertices of C is at least $(1-\epsilon)\delta nmp$. Similarly, the number of attributes adjacent to vertices of $V \setminus X$ is at most $(1+\epsilon)nmp$. Thus there are $\binom{(1-\epsilon)\delta nmp}{2}$ possible choices for v_1 and v_{2k-1}. Setting $t = \zeta n$, there are $t(t-1)(t-2)\cdots(t-k+2)$ many choices for $v_2, v_4, \ldots, v_{2(k-1)}$. Similarly, setting $s = m - (1+\epsilon)nmp$, there are at least $s(s-1)(s-2)\cdots(s-k+3)$ many choices for the nodes $v_3, v_5, \ldots, v_{2k-3}$. By

linearity of expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_k]}{1-o(1)} &\geq p_k \cdot \binom{(1-\epsilon)\delta nmp}{2}\big((1-\epsilon)m\big)^{k-2}(\delta n)^{k-1} \\
&= \frac{p_k}{2}\delta^2\beta^2\gamma^2(1-\epsilon)^2 n^{1+\alpha}\big((1-\epsilon)m\big)^{k-2}(\zeta n)^{k-1} \\
&= \frac{p_k}{2}\delta^2\beta^2\gamma^2(1-\epsilon)^k\zeta^{k-1}n^{(k-1)(1+\alpha)+1} \\
&= \exp\big[-(1+2\epsilon)(k-1)2\beta\gamma^2\big]\delta^2\beta^2\gamma^2(1-\epsilon)^k\zeta^{k-1}n \\
&= n\delta^2\beta^2\gamma^2\exp\Big[k\log(1-\epsilon)+\big(-2(1+2\epsilon)\beta\gamma^2+\log\zeta\big)(k-1)\Big] \\
&= n\delta^2\beta^2\gamma^2 e^{2\beta\gamma^2(1+2\epsilon)}\zeta^{-1}\exp\Big[k\big(\log(1-\epsilon)-2(1+2\epsilon)\beta\gamma^2+\log\zeta\big)\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus there exists a positive constant ξ such that $\mathbb{E}[S_{\xi\log n}] = \omega(1)$, namely:

$$\xi < \frac{-1}{\log(1-\epsilon)-2(1+2\epsilon)\beta\gamma^2+\log\zeta}.$$

Note that the denominator is also negative so we can indeed pick $\xi > 0$.

We now show that S_k is tightly concentrated around its mean for those values of k when $\mathbb{E}[S_k] = \omega(1)$. Write S_k as the sum of n_k random indicator variables $\mathcal{I}_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_{2k-1}}$ where $\mathcal{I}_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_{2k-1}} = 1$ if there is a k-special bipartite path on the vertices $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{2k-1}$. We would like to calculate $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{I}_{u_1,u_2,\ldots,u_{2k-1}} = 1|\mathcal{I}_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_{2k-1}}]$. If $\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{2k-1}\}$ and $\{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{2k-1}\}$ are not disjoint then the probability is 0. Otherwise $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{I}_{u_1,u_2,\ldots,u_{2k-1}} = 1|\mathcal{I}_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_{2k-1}}] \leq p_k/(1-p)^{2k(k-1)}$ as the event $\mathcal{I}_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_{2k-1}}$ implies that

$$N_B(\{v_2, v_4, \ldots, v_{2(k-1)}\}) \cap N_B(\{u_2, u_4, \ldots, u_{2(k-1)}\}) = \emptyset.$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
Var(S_k) &\leq n_k p_k + n_k(n_k-1)\frac{p_{k,v}^2}{(1-p)^{2k(k-1)}} - (n_k p_k)^2 \\
&\leq n_k p_k + (n_k p_k)^2\Big(\frac{1}{(1-p)^{2k(k-1)}} - 1\Big) \\
&\leq n_k p_k + (n_k p_k)^2\Big(e^{-4pk(k-1)} - 1\Big) \qquad (20) \\
&\leq n_k p_k + (n_k p_k)^2\Big(8pk(k-1)\Big). \qquad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

Inequality (20) follows from the fact that $1 - e^x \geq e^{-2x}$ for $0 < x < 1$ while Inequality (21) follows from the fact that $e^x \leq 1 + 2x$ for $0 < x < \log 2$. Thus for $t > 0$ and $k = O(\log n)$, by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[|S_k - \mathbb{E}[S_k]| \geq t\mathbb{E}[S_k]] &\leq \frac{Var(S_k)}{t^2\mathbb{E}[S_k]^2} \\
&= \frac{n_k p_k}{(t n_k p_k)^2} + 8pk(k-1)t^{-2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{t^2 n_k p_k} + 8pk(k-1)t^{-2} = o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have shown a.a.s. that $S_k = \mathbb{E}[S_k](1 \pm o(1))$ when $k = O(\log n)$. In particular we have shown that there exists a positive constant ξ such that a.a.s. G has hyperbolicity at least $\xi \log n$. □

Lemma 13. *Fix positive constants α, β, γ, such that $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta\gamma^2 > 1$. Then there exists a constant $\xi > 0$ such that a.a.s. $G \in G(n, m, p)$ has hyperbolicity at least $\xi \log n$.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof for the case $\alpha > 1$. Pick $\zeta > 0$ such that $(1-\zeta)^2 nmp^2 > 1$. Now let X be a subset of ζn vertices and Y a subset of ζm attributes. Consider the subgraph B' of B induced on $V \setminus X \times A \setminus Y$. Let G' be the subgraph of G derived from the bipartite graph B'; this will be the "exposed graph." Note that as $(1-x)^2 nmp^2 > 1$, a.a.s. the exposed graph has a giant component C of size δn for an appropriate constant c [20].

We again will restrict our inquiry to the existence of k-special bipartite paths on (X, Y, C). Let S_k be the number of k-special bipartite paths (conditioning on the fact that the exposed graph has a giant component of size at least δn). Given the vertices $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{2k-1}$ such that v_1 and v_{2k-1} both have neighbors in C, and such that $\{v_{2i+1}\}_{i=1}^{k-2} \subseteq Y$ and $\{v_{2i}\}_{i=1}^{k-1} \subseteq X$, we would like to know the probability, denoted p_k, that the vertices form a k-special bipartite path P: $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{2k-1}$. In this setting, Equation (17) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
p_k &\geq p^{2k-2}(1-p)^{k^2-3k+2}\Big((1-p)^{|X|-k+1}\Big)^2\Big((1-p)^{n-k+1}\Big)^{k-2}\Big((1-p)^{m-k}\Big)^{k-1} \\
&\geq p^{2k-2}(1-p)^{(k-1)(m-k)+(k-2)n+2\zeta n-2k+2} \\
&\geq p^{2k-2}(1-p)^{(\beta+1)nk+(2\zeta-2-\beta)n-k^2-k+2} \\
&\geq p^{2k-2}\exp\big[-2p\big((\beta+1)nk+\gamma(2\zeta-2-\beta)n-k^2-k+2\big)\big] \\
&\geq p^{2k-2}\exp\big[-2\big(\gamma k(\beta+1)+\gamma(2\zeta-2-\beta)\big)\big]\big(1-o(1)\big)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds for $k = o(n)$.

Again, we count the ways in which a k-special bipartite path can occur. Setting $t = \zeta n$, there are $t(t-1)(t-2)\cdots(t-k+2)$ many choices for $v_2, v_4, \ldots, v_{2(k-1)}$. Similarly, setting $s = \zeta m$, there are $s(s-1)(s-2)\cdots(s-k+3)$ many choices for the nodes $v_3, v_5, \ldots, v_{2k-3}$. By Lemma 2 w.h.p. there are at least $(1-\epsilon)\beta\delta n$ attributes adjacent to vertices of C. Thus, by linearity of expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathbb{E}[X_k]}{(1-o(1))} &\geq \frac{1}{2}p_k(\zeta n)^{k-1}(\zeta m)^{k-2}((1-\epsilon)\beta\delta n)^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}n(\gamma^2\zeta^2\beta)^{k-1}((1-\epsilon)\beta\delta)^2\exp\big[-2\big(k(\gamma\beta+\gamma)+\gamma(2\zeta-2-\beta)\big)\big] \\
&\geq \frac{((1-\epsilon)\beta\delta)^2}{(\gamma^2\zeta^2\beta)}n\exp\big[-2\big(k(\gamma\beta+\gamma+\log\big(\gamma^2\zeta^2\beta\big))+\gamma(2\zeta-2-\beta)\big)\big].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus there is a $\xi > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[S_{\xi \log n - 1}] = \omega(1)$, namely any ξ satisfying

$$\xi < \frac{1}{2\beta\gamma+\gamma+2\log(\gamma^2\zeta^2\beta)}.$$

The proof that S_k is tightly concentrated around its mean is exactly the same as in the case when $\alpha > 1$, so we omit it here. This finishes the proof for the case when $\alpha = 1$. □

Lemma 14. *Fix positive constants α, β, γ, such that $\alpha < 1$ and $\beta\gamma^2 > 1$. Then there exists a constant $\xi > 0$ such that a.a.s. $G \in G(n, m, p)$ has hyperbolicity at least $\xi \log n$.*

Proof. In essence, the proof of Lemma 12 consists in showing that the bipartite graph B, associated with G a.a.s. contains a $2\lfloor k/4 \rfloor$-slim triangle, i.e. that there exist three vertices x, y, and z with shortest paths $P[x, y], P[y, z]$, and $P[x, z]$ between them such that

$$\exists v \in P[x, y] : \forall w \in P[x, z] \cup P[z, y], d_G(v, w) \leq 2\lfloor k/4 \rfloor.$$

This is then used to show that G has a $\lfloor k/4 \rfloor$-slim triangle.

Note that the bipartite graphs which define the intersection graphs $G(n, m, p)$ and $G(m, n, p)$ have the same distribution: in the first case the intersection graph is formed by projecting onto the nodes of the bipartite graph while in the second case, the projection is onto the attributes. It is not hard to see that if the bipartite graph B contains a 2δ-slim triangle then both of the two possible projections will contain δ-slim triangles. Thus the proof of Lemma 14 follows directly from the proof of Lemma 12. □

6 Conclusion and Open Problems

In this paper we have determined the conditions under which random intersection graphs exhibit two types of algorithmically useful structure. We proved that graphs in $G(n, m, p)$ are structurally sparse (have bounded expansion) precisely when the number of attributes in the associated bipartite graph grows faster than the number of nodes ($\alpha > 1$). Moreover, we showed that when the generated graphs are not structurally sparse, they fail to achieve even much weaker notions of sparsity (in fact, w.h.p. they contain large cliques). We conclude that the tool kit stemming from the bounded expansion framework is applicable to sparse real-world networks whose structure is well-modeled by random intersection graphs with $\alpha > 1$. On the other hand, we showed that the metric structure of random intersection graphs is not tree-like for all values of α: the hyperbolicity (and treelength) grows at least logarithmically in n. While we only determine a lower bound for the hyperbolicity, we believe this to be the correct order of magnitude, as the diameter (a natural upper bound for the hyperbolicity) of similar model of random intersection graphs was shown to be $O(\log n)$ [28] for a similar range of parameter values.

A question that naturally arises from these results is if structural sparsity should be an expected characteristic of practically relevant random graph models. Further, are the expansion functions small enough to enable practical fpt algorithms? Preliminary empirical evaluations (using a related specialized coloring number) for random intersection graphs with $\alpha > 1$ indicate the answer is

affirmative. Furthermore, can the random intersection graph model be sensibly modified such that the clustering is tunable while being structurally sparse?

Acknowledgments: The authors thank Kevin Jasik of RWTH Aachen University for running the experiments. Portions of this research are a product of the ICERM research cluster "Towards Efficient Algorithms Exploiting Graph Structure", co-organized by B. Sullivan, E. Demaine, and D. Marx in April 2014.

N. Lemons funded by the Department of Energy at Los Alamos National Laboratory under contract DE-AC52-06NA25396 through the LDRD Program. F. Sánchez Villaamil funded by DFG-Project RO 927/13-1 "Pragmatic Parameterized Algorithms". B. D. Sullivan supported in part by DARPA GRAPHS/SPAWAR Grant N66001-14-1-4063, the Gordon & Betty Moore Foundation, and the National Consortium for Data Science. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of DARPA, SSC Pacific, DOE, the Moore Foundation, or the NCDS.

References

1. F. G. Ball, D. J. Sirl, and P. Trapman. Epidemics on random intersection graphs. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 24(3):1081–1128, 06 2014.
2. M. Behrisch. Component evolution in random intersection graphs. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 14(R17), 2007.
3. S. R. Blackburn, D. R. Stinson, and J. Upadhyay. On the complexity of the herding attack and some related attacks on hash functions. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 64(1-2):171–193, 2012.
4. M. Bloznelis. Degree and clustering coefficient in sparse random intersection graphs. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 23:1254–1289, 2013.
5. M. Bloznelis, J. Jaworski, and V. Kurauskas. Assortativity and clustering of sparse random intersection graphs. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 18:1–24, 2013.
6. M. Bloznelis and V. Kurauskas. Large cliques in sparse random intersection graphs. *ArXiv pre-print arXiv:1302.4627*, February 2013.
7. M. Bridson and A. Häfliger. *Metric Spaces of Non-Positive Curvature*. Grundlehren Der Mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer, 2009.
8. W. Chen, W. Fang, G. Hu, and M. W. Mahoney. On the hyperbolicity of small-world and tree-like random graphs. In *Proc. of 23rd ISAAC*, pages 278–288, 2012.
9. V. Chepoi, F. F. Dragan, B. Estellon, M. Habib, and Y. Vaxès. Diameters, centers, and approximating trees of δ-hyperbolic geodesic spaces and graphs. In *Symposium on Computational Geometry*, pages 59–68, 2008.
10. M. Deijfen and W. Kets. Random intersection graphs with tunable degree distribution and clustering. *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences*, 23:661–674, 10 2009.
11. M. Deijfen and W. Kets. Random intersection graphs with tunable distribution and clustering. *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences*, 23:661–674, 2009.
12. E. D. Demaine, F. Reidl, P. Rossmanith, F. Sánchez Villaamil, S. Sikdar, and B. D. Sullivan. Structural sparsity of complex networks: Bounded expansion in random models and real-world graphs. *CoRR*, abs/1406.2587, 2014.
13. Z. Dvořák, D. Král', and R. Thomas. Testing first-order properties for subclasses of sparse graphs. *J. ACM*, 60(5):36, 2013.

14. E. Godehardt, J. Jarowski, and K. Rybarczyk. Clustering coefficients of random intersection graphs. In *Challenges at the interface of data analysis computer science and optimization*, pages 243–253. Springer, 2012.
15. M. Gromov. Hyperbolic groups. In *Essays in Group Theory*, volume 8 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 75–263. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.
16. J. Jaworski, M. Karoński, and D. Stark. The degree of a typical vertex in generalized random intersection graph models. *Discrete Mathematics*, 306:2152–2165, 2006.
17. E. Jonckheere, P. Lohsoonthorn, and F. Bonahon. Scaled Gromov hyperbolic graphs. *J. of Graph Theory*, 57(2):157–180, 2008.
18. M. Karoński, E. K. Scheinerman, and K. B. Singer-Cohen. On random intersection graphs: the subgraph problem. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 8:131–159, 1999.
19. R. Kleinberg. Geographic routing using hyperbolic space. In *Proc. of the 26th INFOCOM*, pages 1902–1909, 2007.
20. A. N. Lagerås and M. Lindholm. A note on the component structure in random intersection graphs with tunable clustering. *Electronic J. Combinatorics*, 15(N10), 2008.
21. O. Narayan and I. Saniee. Large-scale curvature of networks. *Physical Review E*, 84:066108, Dec 2011.
22. J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez. Grad and classes with bounded expansion I. and II. *Eur. Jour. Comb.*, 29(3):760–791, 2008.
23. J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez. First order properties on nowhere dense structures. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 75(3):868–887, 2010.
24. J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez. On nowhere dense graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 32(4):600–617, 2011.
25. J. Nešetřil and P. Ossona de Mendez. *Sparsity: Graphs, Structures, and Algorithms*, volume 28 of *Algorithms & Combinatorics*. Springer, 2012.
26. J. Nešetřil, P. Ossona de Mendez, and D. R. Wood. Characterisations and examples of graph classes with bounded expansion. *Eur. Jour. Comb.*, 33(3):350–373, 2012.
27. M. E. J. Newman, S. H. Strogatz, and D. J. Watts. Random graphs with arbitrary degree distributions and their applications. *Physical Review E*, 64(2), 2001.
28. K. Rybarczyk. Diameter, connectivity, and phase transition of the uniform random intersection graph. *Discrete Mathematics*, pages 1998–2019, 2011.
29. K. Rybarczyk. The coupling method for inhomogeneous random intersection graphs. *Preprint. arXiv:1301.0466*, 2013.
30. K. Singer-Cohen. Random intersection graphs. *PhD thesis, Department of Mathematical Sciences, The Johns Hopkins University*, 1995.
31. D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz. Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks. *Nature*, 393:440–442, 1998.
32. J. Zhao. Minimum node degree and k-connectivity in wireless networks with unreliable links. In *Information Theory (ISIT), 2014 IEEE International Symposium on*, pages 246–250. IEEE, 2014.
33. J. Zhao, Osman Y., and V. Gligor. On k-connectivity and minimum vertex degree in random s-intersection graphs. In *ANALCO*, 2015.
34. J. Zhao, O. Yagan, and V. Gligor. Connectivity in secure wireless sensor networks under transmission constraints. In *52nd Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, pages 1294–1301. IEEE, 2014.
35. J. Zhao, O. Yagan, and V. Gligor. On the strengths of connectivity and robustness in general random intersection graphs. In *53rd Annual IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 3661–3668. IEEE, 2014.